DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 295 697 JC 880 263

TITLE	Action Report: A Body of Recommendations To Address Critical Curricular Issues in the Los Angeles Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION	Los Angeles Community Coll. District, Calif. Div. of Educational Planning and Development.
PUB DATE	Aug 87
NOTE	58p.; A product of the Curriculum Lab.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Community Colleges; Curriculum Development; Faculty Development; General Education; Instructional Development; *Research and Development; Research and Instruction Units; Two Year Colleges; Writing Instruction
IDENTIFIERS	*Los Angeles Community College District CA; *Los Angeles Community Colleges CA

ABSTRACT

The Los Angeles Community College District's Core Curriculum Development Laboratory (CCDL), a task force of faculty members and resource staff, was established to identify successful teaching practices and programs within the district, sponsor curricular projects, assist in designing new instructional models, and make recommendations to promote curriculum research and revision. Drawing from a review of the literature, meetings with groups involved in curricular reform, and on-campus activities, the CCDL developed a series of recommendations for action in the following areas: (1) networking and communication; (2) writing across the curriculum; (3) the new writing standards set forth in Title V of the California Education Code; (4) writing assessment and course placement; (5) writing competency; (6) critical thinking skills; (7) general education course sequence and programs; (8) interdisciplinary courses; (9) curricular reform in vocational education; (10) international education; (11) English as a Second Language; (12) foreign language proficiencies; (13) orientation and advisement; (14) the development of model curriculum sequences; (15) competencies required for success; (16) investigation of educational technologies and instructional delivery systems and the dissemination of information to faculty; (17) obsolete course content and teaching methods; (18) faculty networks and development grants; (19) obsolete equipment; (20) creation of a Faculty Forum for Achievement; (21) gender equity; and (22) awareness of health care. For each recommendation, relevant issues and problems are identified, goals are set forth, background information is provided, and specific activities are detailed. 27 references. (MDB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED295697

ACTION

REPORT

A BODY OF RECOMMENDATIONS TO ADDRESS CRITICAL CURRICULAR ISSUES IN THE LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGES

AUGUST 1987

LOS ANGELES COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT
DIVISION OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
CURRICULUM LABORATORY

JC 880 263

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. Erickson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Los Angeles Community College District
617 West Seventh Street
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(213) 628-7788

Board of Trustees

Harold W. Garvin, *President*
Lindsay Conner, *Vice President*
Wallace Albertson
Arthur Bronson
Wallace B. Knox
Dr. David Lopez-Lee
Julia L. Wu
Suzzane D. Goodlow, *Student Member*

District Administration

Dr. Leslie Koltai, *Chancellor*
Dr. Cedric A. Sampson, *Vice Chancellor, Educational Research & Development Division*
Dr. Virginia F. Mulrooney, *Vice Chancellor, Division of Human Resources*
Thomas M. Fallo, *Vice Chancellor, Business Services*
Warren S. Kinsler, *General Counsel*

Equal Opportunity Policy

The Los Angeles Community College District is committed to the philosophy of equal opportunity/equal access in all its employment, educational programs and services. Thus, we are firmly committed to a policy of non-discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, ancestry, religion, creed, sex, age, handicap, marital status, sexual orientation, or veteran status in our employment or educational programs and activities.

In order to ensure the proper handling of all civil rights matters, each college in the District has its own Affirmative Action Representative; Title IX / Sex-Equity Coordinator; Section 504, Coordinator of Handicap Programs; and an Ombudsperson. Direct initial inquiries to the District Office of Affirmative Action Programs and Services, (213) 628-7788 extension 2315.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface v

Acknowledgements vii

Introduction 1

Beginnings 1

Undertakings 4

Call to Action 7

Mission 8

Goals 8

Recommendations for Action 9

- Networking and Communication 10
- Writing Across the Curriculum 11
- Title 5 Review - Writing Standards 13
- Writing Assessment and Placement 15
- Writing Competency 17
- Critical Thinking 19
- General Education 21
- General Education Course Sequence and Programs 22
- Course Linkages and Interdisciplinary Teaching 23
- Vocational Education 24
- International Education 26
- English as a Second Language 30
- Foreign Language Proficiencies 33

Orientation and Advisement 34

Model Programs 35

Competencies Required for Success 37

Delivery Modes of Instruction 38

Obsolete Course Content and Teaching Methodologies 40

Networks/Grants 42

Obsolete Equipment 43

Faculty Forum for Achievement 45

Gender Equity 46

Awareness of Health Care 48

Selected References 49

PREFACE

In the Spring of 1986, at a time in which the Los Angeles Community College District had reached what will surely be recognized as its low point in enrollment, funding stability and employee morale, Chancellor Leslie Koltai and the Board of Trustees launched two important and strategically sound initiatives. The first was to direct the energies and resources of the District toward the objective of enrollment growth. That effort was rewarded by an 11% upsurge in the Fall semester of 1986. Growth continued in the Spring, confirming that the District was firmly on the road to recovery. The turnaround in enrollment has added immeasurably to the District's financial well being, public image, and morale.

The second initiative undertaken was the decision to invest more of the District's resources in research and development. The Educational Services Division changed its name and its emphasis, becoming the reorganized Educational Research and Development Division, and funds were set aside for the establishment of new courses and programs, and for the creation of new research units, such as the Curriculum Laboratory.

Designed as a vehicle for tapping the talent and creativity of the campus faculties, the Curriculum Laboratory brings together outstanding faculty leaders who can act as researchers, facilitators and agents of communication in the area of curriculum design and renewal. This ACTION REPORT is proof of the value of the Curriculum Laboratory. There is a need for theoretical analysis of problems, and there is a need for a plan of action. The Report is successful in both areas; it points us in the right directions, and it tells us how to get there.

The Los Angeles Community College District is committed to maintaining a curriculum which provides our students with the maximum opportunity to achieve their educational goals. I commend the Curriculum Laboratory for its contribution to the quality of the dialogue, and to the quality of our educational programs.

Cedric A. Sampson
Vice Chancellor
Educational Research and Development Division

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Bringing together a group of faculty of diverse talents, attitudes and backgrounds to tackle the complex subject of curricular reform has been a stimulating, challenging, frustrating and rewarding experience. The working atmosphere was one of candor and of goodwill. The belief under which we operated was that the faculty wish to provide the best possible education to their students and that they will go to considerable lengths to see that our educational programs strive to be the best.

In that environment, the many and various recommendations for action presented in this report were developed. Each member of the Curriculum Laboratory contributed mightily to the final report.

We are extremely grateful to the tireless efforts of Librada G. Villanueva for the typing chores associated with this effort, as well as for her ability to keep our office running smoothly. We also appreciate the efforts of Dr. Jack Fujimoto and Mae Seidner who helped us connect with resources both in and out of the District and who brought us back to reality when we were tempted to stray.

Finally, we want to thank the faculty with whom we met for frankly sharing their concerns and ideas, and to the Trustees and District Administration for providing for this faculty effort to address the issues. Now, on to the task.

The Curriculum Laboratory
James N. Hardesty, Chair

INTRODUCTION

The Los Angeles Community College District, because of its size, location and leadership role, occupies a strategic position in many educational issues, not the least of which is curricular reform. Recognizing the need for educational leadership and faculty involvement in addressing the many curricular issues identified by numerous local, state and national group studies of higher education in recent years, Chancellor Leslie Koltai announced in his March 5, 1986, State of the District Address his intent to establish a Core Curriculum Development Laboratory, a body of faculty representing various disciplines with the purpose to develop educational programs, work with campus and faculty committees, implement newly developed programs, monitor the success of programs as academic delivery systems and serve as a catalyst for experiments in course linkages and interdisciplinary teaching. In further clarification of its purpose, Vice Chancellor Cedric Sampson described the Curriculum Laboratory as a task force that would develop or identify sequential courses of study leading to the completion of a desired degree or certificate objective within two years.

BEGINNINGS

To begin the work of the Laboratory in the Fall of 1986, a cadre of nine faculty was assigned to constitute an Ad Hoc Planning Group assisted by a District Resource Staff including Jack Fujimoto and Mae Seidner who served as Chair and Assistant Chair, respectively, of the Ad Hoc Group. Valuable contributions to the effort were made by ex-officio member, Patricia Siever, President of the District Academic Senate. This group set out to review the

purposes and to define the issues, concerns and problems to be addressed by the permanent Curriculum Laboratory staff. The report of the efforts and findings of this Group was set forth in The AGENDA: Core Curriculum Development Laboratory, February 1987.

The open faculty positions in the Curriculum Laboratory were announced to the District faculty in late Fall 1986. Representatives of the District Faculty Senate and the Office of Educational Policy interviewed the applicants.

January 1987 saw the selection and assignment of seven regular faculty to the Curriculum Laboratory for the Spring 1987 semester. These faculty appointees are:

James N. Hardesty, Mathematics, Los Angeles Pierce College; Chair

Bruce Anders, English, West Los Angeles College

Richard Block, English, Los Angeles City College

Lauren Mc Kenzie, Mathematics/Science, Los Angeles Harbor College

Carmelita Thomas, Humanities/Languages, Los Angeles City College

Patricia Wilson, Fashion Design, Los Angeles Trade-Technical College

George Wistreich, Life Science/Allied Health, East Los Angeles College

They have been assisted by the following District Resource Staff:

Jack Fujimoto

Mae Seidner

Stan Levine

Carolyn Widener

Lloyd Thomas

Joan Clemons

Librada Villanueva

Barbara Hobbs

Rose Marie Patino

and by the ex-officio members:

Leslie Koltai, Chancellor

Cedric Sampson, Vice Chancellor

Patricia Siever, President, District Academic Senate

These people brought to the project a great deal of energy and enthusiasm for curricular improvement, a conviction in the abilities of the faculty to address essential and, sometimes, controversial curricular matters, and the belief that well-thought-out recommendations could and would have the support of all elements of the District community. It is in this spirit of collective commitment and collegial endeavor that the recommendations for action called for here are presented. To act effectively on these recommendations as a college community will, we believe, enhance the teaching/learning environment for the myriad students who pass through the portals of the nine college campuses.

UNDERTAKINGS

Reviewing the work of the Ad Hoc Planning Group, reviewing the literature, making contact with a number of groups involved in curricular reform, and formulating recommendations for action and implementation has occupied the time and energy of the Curriculum Laboratory staff in its first semester of existence. The main body of this report will set forth the numerous action recommendations. In addition to researching the issues and developing recommendations, the Laboratory staff has undertaken a number of projects already.

Having determined that its first priority should be to encourage, recognize and support the faculty in their efforts to explore and bring about curricular reform, the Laboratory sponsored a very successful Critical Thinking Workshop for faculty featuring Dr. Richard Paul of the Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique at Sonoma State University. Following from the workshop, the Laboratory produced a document entitled Critical Thinking Resource Collection, May 1987, for distribution to College libraries, Academic Senate Presidents and Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs for faculty use. The Laboratory has facilitated funding for further training of six faculty to provide follow-up workshops during the next year on the use and application of Critical Thinking.

In an effort to clarify the expectations of students seeking to transfer to a four-year institution in the physical sciences or engineering, the Curriculum Laboratory staff has developed a model curriculum document for physical science and engineering transfer students. This document will be distributed

to affected departments in the Fall 1987 semester for discussion and campus adaptation. Another project aimed at providing students with answers to college enrollment questions has been the development of a brief Student Guide prepared in an attractive and light-hearted way. This Guide is sufficiently universal in scope to be usable on all campuses, with one page available for specific campus information.

Additional activities of the staff of the Curriculum Laboratory have included meetings with a multitude of Academic Alliance Groups sponsored by the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) Center for Academic Interinstitutional Programs and involving many Los Angeles Community College District faculty; participating as panelists in meetings of the Articulation Council of California and the District-sponsored Intersegmental Conference; and weekly staff meetings, many involving faculty representing such groups as the District Academic Senate, the Educational Policy Advisory Committee, campus Curriculum Committee Chairs, various discipline committees, and others.

One goal in all of these efforts has been to move the activities of the Curriculum Laboratory to the campuses as soon as possible. A case in point has been the convening of the Chairs of Science, Mathematics and Engineering departments to explore shared and cross-discipline concerns that may be addressed, in part, by external funding of creative proposals. This group is planning a calendar of activities for the forthcoming academic year. A similar action was taken by the chairs of Foreign Languages who met with instructors of International classes and members of the International Education Committee. This group will continue to explore strategies to develop new approaches and content to introduce greater global awareness in all subject areas.

A brief list of additional activities, currently underway, many of which are included with more detail in the recommendations, include:

- Development of regularly distributed newsletter
- Planning for a faculty forum on general education and a "Transfer Core"
- Printing and distribution of the Student Guide
- Development of a student advisement model for Mathematics Courseflow
- Assisting campus faculty groups in implementing required Title 5 Course changes
- Development of a process for the review of general education sequences relative to a specific major
- Collection of campus information regarding existing offerings of interdisciplinary studies and core courses and programs
- Review with Mathematics faculty of course offerings, competencies, course flow, and student assessment and placement relative to providing students with the best possible instruction
- Distribution of material relative to the instroduction of critical thinking in all courses, and providing assistance and guidance when needed.

- Simplification, in cooperation with interested faculty, of offerings in the Humanities and related disciplines.

- Development, in cooperation with Foreign Language and International Studies faculty, of courses and activities to expand international awareness to students in all majors.

- Development of a Writing Across the Curriculum program to aid in implementing the new Title 5 requirements.

CALL TO ACTION

The Curriculum Laboratory has formulated a mission statement and a broad set of goals to be sought in the actions it proposes. Consonant with this mission and goals statement, it has developed an initial set of recommendations for action by the Curriculum Laboratory and other district bodies. We hope that the district community will give serious consideration to these recommendations, particularly to those that have special appeal to the reader's expertise, interest and abilities, that the Curriculum Laboratory may serve in its intended role as a catalyst for bringing about a faculty review of curriculum and faculty involvement in needed and effective change.

MISSION

Responding to state-wide faculty directives to strengthen academic quality, the Curriculum Laboratory of the Los Angeles Community College District has the mission of working with the faculty in a collegial and cooperative spirit to enhance the teaching and learning process. In conjunction with Curriculum Committees and other faculty groups at both the campus and District level, the Curriculum Laboratory staff will seek to identify successful teaching practices and programs within the District, sponsor curricular projects of potential benefit to faculty, assist in designing new instructional models and, in general, make recommendations that may promote and assist curricular research and revision.

GOALS

The goals of the Curriculum Laboratory in accomplishing its mission are to:

(1) Serve as a catalyst for experiments in course linkages and interdisciplinary teaching.

(2) Work with faculty and curriculum committees.

(3) Facilitate the implementation of newly developed programs.

(4) Assist in the review of program success from both faculty and student participation.

(5) Support the development of educational programs.

(6) Identify and develop sequential courses of study leading students to the completion of specific degree or certificate objectives within two years.

(7) Provide information to faculty and administration regarding curricular development and reform.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

From the preceding statements of mission and goals, and from the investigations and deliberations of the staff of the Curriculum Laboratory, flow a number of recommendations for action. These recommendations are presented along with a statement of the issues to be addressed by each group of recommendations, the goal(s) to be met, and, in some instances, background information leading to that group of recommendations. An attempt has been made to identify the group or groups in the District that are deemed most appropriate for acting upon each recommendation. Finally, it may be the case that more than one recommendation attempts to address a specific issue in different ways. Such recommendations appearing here have been left in the report to encourage, rather than stifle, a multiplicity of creative solutions to the curricular problems faced by the District.

While the recommendations are presented here in a serial order, this order is not intended to be a priority or preferential ordering. In some cases of related topics, an attempt has been made to list the broader scope recommendations prior to those more narrowly directed.

It is hoped and urged that all readers of this report will become involved in some way in implementing the recommendations presented here.

NETWORKING AND COMMUNICATION

ISSUE: Growing sense of alienation of faculty members and general feeling of isolation caused by fragmentary, intermittent and often confusing communication within the district.

GOAL: Promote individual faculty involvement in curriculum development and provide regular and timely communication about curriculum matters.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory should establish the printing and districtwide distribution of a periodic Curriculum Laboratory newsletter containing information gathered by its members through consultation with existing committees and groups involved in curricular activities, such as: EPAC, Faculty Senate, District Curriculum Planning and Development Committee, Committee for the Advancement of Teaching, Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs, International Education Committee, et cetera.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should encourage each College Faculty Senate to establish a faculty committee to work with the Curriculum Laboratory as advisers and implementers. Such committees would activate and work with other special committees called for in these recommendations, e.g. general education committee, writing across the curriculum committee, etc.

WRITING ACROSS THE CURRICULUM

GOAL: Address the need for faculty development in the District to incorporate writing assignments in meaningful ways in college credit classes and develop District consensus on standards and requirements for written assignments.

BACKGROUND: Our District is particularly blessed with resources to accomplish these goals. Two of our instructors have extensive experience in Writing Across the Curriculum workshops at secondary and college levels and one instructor recently wrote a comprehensive proposal for faculty development workshops. The workshops would include three aspects of presentation:

(1) Immersion in writing skills acquisition through wide reading and intensive discussions.

(2) Periodic demonstrations by writing and subject area teachers from three levels of education

(3) Sustained writing practice by teacher-participants themselves, in order to develop an internal sense of the writing process that they would require of their students. The philosophy of these workshops would be that the teachers are best able to develop their own hypotheses about the legitimate role of writing in their own classes. Therefore, each teacher participant would develop his/her own lesson plans incorporating writing into his/her existing courses, field test these and bring them back with results for feedback and revision.

It is assumed that without serious writing projects in content college

classes, no amount of remedial or regular instruction in writing in English classes is likely to make significant positive changes in student's abilities to write. Moreover, it is clear and basic to most pedagogies that writing is a crucial adjunct to the learning process and without a healthy measure of writing in all college courses, these courses do not provide circumstances wherein students may delve deeply into complexities of subjects they undertake to study.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Office of Staff Development should undertake to fund teachers recommended by the College Faculty Senates for staff development workshops to develop writing components in their classes.

(1) A Writing Across the Curriculum coordinator position should be developed and staffed.

(2) Writing Across the Curriculum activities should proceed along interdepartmental lines.

(3) Writing Across the Curriculum projects should be funded by the District.

TITLE 5 REVIEW - WRITING STANDARDS

ISSUE: Assessment-Placement Tests that accurately reflect standards, requirements and content of college-wide (and Districtwide) expectations about reading and writing.

GOAL: Implement Title 5 writing requirements on time and prepare students for increased writing demands across the curriculum.

BACKGROUND: Forty-five percent, or more, of students entering the District for the first time are placed into English 21, one year below Freshman Reading and Composition, a baccalaureate course. Presently, students at this pre-collegiate level are co-enrolled in college transfer and vocational education classes. It is presumed that Title 5 requirements will make this situation untenable.

Recognizing the significance of English 21, an ad hoc committee composed of the English chairs (or designees) met for a week (summer 1986) to suggest a new course outline for adoption and to align the course with other remedial courses in the remedial ladder so that specific outcomes could be achieved in the year leading to English 101.

The committee members adopted an intensive 5-hour course (up from three) that focuses on academic reading and writing to prepare students to compete and learn in their other college subject areas. The new course significantly upgrades standards and requirements or needs of other subject areas, by demanding sustained reading and writing rather than more piecemeal approaches.

The emergence of this new course (which according to placement could enroll nearly 50% of the incoming District student body) provides a unique opportunity for the District to bring together faculty in all disciplines to state reading and writing standards and requirements. This kind of cooperation is likely to result in far better communication to the students of the faculty's expectations and will facilitate breaking down the barriers that have isolated "skills" teachers from their colleagues.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The colleges should convene inter-departmental college committees to address issues of college (and, ultimately, District) writing standards and requirements in conjunction with District liaison faculty already working on language arts concerns, the English Council, the Curriculum Councils, the Curriculum Laboratory, and, perhaps, 4-year institutions.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should work with the above committees to facilitate the introduction of writing in a multi-disciplinary context.

WRITING ASSESSMENT AND PLACEMENT

GOAL: Assessment-Placement Tests that accurately reflect standards, requirements and content of college-wide (and District-wide) expectations about reading and writing.

BACKGROUND: Current Assessment-Placement protocols, based as they are on non-academic reading, language usage tests and personal narrative writing tasks, confuse students about the nature of the college curriculum and even about the English courses into which they are placed. This confusion is compounded by the fact that the current District Competency Tests in Writing and Reading are structured (very reasonably) around one or more college level readings which serve as the basis for student compositions. Moreover, credit-bearing course changes, currently mandated under the Title 5, to include meaningful writing as a mode of instruction and evaluation, have no corresponding model for their writing tasks - essay tests, report papers, et cetera - in the assessment-placement tests.

The present assessment-placement apparatus, a commercial venture which "roughcuts" students into the English tracks, bypasses some unique opportunities to initiate students into faculty expectations about reading and writing for their courses and to involve the faculty as a whole in the issues of college writing standards. Such broad faculty involvement would break into the tendency toward isolation of the English-Basic Skills curriculum from the College as a whole. This isolation will become increasingly detrimental as Title 5 requirements are implemented. For example, it will be realized by

teachers who will depend on a "feed" of writing-competent students through the English 28 track, that 50% or more of their potential enrollment are stuck in "their place" in English 21, directed there through a placement apparatus that does not account very well for the kinds of writing tasks these teachers have incorporated into their classes. Rather, it is through a consensus-reaching process, focused on the goal of realistic placement practices that are tied to an emerging sense of college standards, that assessment-placement will serve the needs of the college and the matriculated students.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Curriculum Laboratory and the Writing Across the Curriculum coordinator should facilitate:

(1) The involvement of full-time faculty from across the academic and vocational disciplines in the evaluation of writing samples in English placement. Preparatory Workshops, using English faculty as resources and past placement papers as already normed samples, could train non-English teachers in placement techniques and problems. Teachers from many disciplines, so trained, could begin to lead their colleges toward clear and equitable standards for placement and course work.

(2) A core of well-trained, sensitive faculty leaders to develop a realistic assessment-placement test to consist, simply, of one or more short college-level readings to serve as the basis for a brief written assessment, and the development and maintenance of this test (through continuous supply of alternate forms) would be the outcome of faculty dialogs on writing standards.

WRITING COMPETENCY

GOAL: Provide all LACCD students with specific statements of standards and examples of college level writing.

BACKGROUND: In 1985, a committee of nine English instructors (recommended by the Council) met periodically for an entire academic year to write a "Los Angeles Community College District Writing Competency Booklet". The heart of the booklet was a set of eleven student-written essays which were based on a topic that required students to read passages from college level materials. The eleven student essays were selected from over 200 essays written by students from across the District as part of their Finals in English 28. Chosen because they represent the strengths and weaknesses of the entire group of 200 Final Test essays, these eleven student papers, typed exactly as the students wrote them, were each followed by teacher commentaries to help the students focus on the merits and shortcomings of each. While the process of arriving at the paper selections and writing the commentaries helped the English composition teachers clarify and unify their standards, the group of papers, arranged from best to worst on a six-point evaluation scale borrowed from UCLA, provided students with concrete examples of their teachers' expectations. As the committee members met periodically with their home campus English Departments, a consensus about standards for written composition (task and standards) was reached through this project.

The Writing Competency Booklet, which was funded by the State Chancellor's Office Fund for Instructional Improvement (FII) has gone past its pilot phase in which the booklet was distributed to nine classes on nine campuses for feedback from students and teachers. The reviews of the Booklet were very good and districts outside L.A. have asked for copies. Our students could continue to benefit from this effort, but for the fact that the District has not funded reprinting requests.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The District should fund printing and wide dissemination of the Writing Competency Booklet.

(2) The District should promote replication of this process at the English 21 level, where standards and requirements are extremely diverse, but where 50% or more of our students place by testing.

CRITICAL THINKING

ISSUE: Coursework must include development of critical thinking skills, as required by Title 5 changes.

PROBLEM: Instruction that relies too heavily on rote, drill, and objective testing sidesteps opportunities to teach higher order cognitive skills.

GOAL: To introduce students to the concept of critical thinking and to provide students with the instructional tools and techniques necessary to apply critical thinking to their courses.

BACKGROUND: As a reaction to the above concern, issue and problem, as well as the recently introduced changes in the Title 5 requirements calling for critical thinking components in all course outlines, the members of the Curriculum Laboratory sponsored and organized a Critical Thinking Workshop during the month of May, 1987.

The Workshop was led by the renowned authority on Critical Thinking, Richard Paul, of the Sonoma State University Center for Critical Thinking and Moral Critique. There was Districtwide faculty attendance and reaction to the workshop was very positive.

In preparation for followup activities, the session was videotaped and the Curriculum Laboratory facilitated the funding of six faculty to attend a 5-day intensive workshop and conference on Critical Thinking in the Summer of 1987.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory should compile the several articles, handouts and other materials dealing with the workshop topic into a document entitled CRITICAL THINKING RESOURCE COLLECTION. This document will be distributed in Summer 1987 to workshop participants that requested such information as well as to all LACCD campus libraries, Campus Academic Senate Presidents, and Offices of Academic Affairs.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory, in coordination with each college Academic Senate and Office of Academic Affairs, should facilitate future follow-up workshops on critical thinking at the campus level during the 1987-88 academic year using faculty resource persons as leaders.

GENERAL EDUCATION

GOALS:

(1) Provide information to faculty and administration regarding curricular development and reform.

(2) Work with faculty and curriculum committees.

(3) Serve as a catalyst for experiments in course linkages and interdisciplinary teaching.

(4) Stimulate on-going faculty discussion, review and revision of the general education breadth requirements of the college curriculum.

BACKGROUND: Early in the Spring 1987 semester, the Curriculum Laboratory members determined that there was a need among the faculty to discuss the current issues and forces affecting the general education function of the colleges and that a forum to present and exchange information about that should be conducted for all faculty in the early part of the 1987-88 academic year.

RECOMMENDATION: The Curriculum Laboratory should conduct an all-day faculty forum in the Fall of 1987 focused on "General Education -The Core" to present the topic and the state and local issues surrounding it and to provide an opportunity to develop campus mechanisms to address the issues at that level.

GENERAL EDUCATION COURSE SEQUENCE AND PROGRAMS

ISSUE: There is no specific general education package for transfer students in the Los Angeles Community College District.

PROBLEM: Students tend to take the wrong general education courses to best meet their needs.

GOAL: Strengthen general education course sequences and programs in the Los Angeles Community College District.

BACKGROUND: In line with the statewide efforts to formulate a "transfer Core" curriculum, a modest effort has begun to examine existing course offerings to meet general education breadth requirements and prepare students beyond their major preparations. Such an examination should assess enrollment patterns, course objectives, relation to the programs and majors, and produce recommendations for meaningful "core" patterns in specific majors, both transfer and occupational.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory should conduct an examination as indicated above, specific to some selected majors.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should work with campus faculty, develop and disseminate, as a model for campus use, a documented process whereby faculty in the various disciplines could assess the relevant curricular offerings relative to specific majors.

COURSE LINKAGES AND INTERDISCIPLINARY TEACHING

PROBLEM: Can existing course offerings be identified that have cross-discipline connections?

GOAL: Serve as a catalyst for experiments in course linkages and interdisciplinary teaching.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory should obtain, with the assistance of each Office of Academic Affairs, the information regarding the interdisciplinary offerings and core curriculum programs at each campus.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should disseminate course outlines and related information regarding successful interdisciplinary offerings.

(3) The Curriculum Laboratory should facilitate faculty workshops on designing and implementing interdisciplinary courses, particularly as such courses relate to general education core courses.

(4) The Curriculum Laboratory should continue to cooperate with the efforts of the various segments of education through the Academic Alliances, Intersegmental Conferences, statewide committees, etc., to bring about appropriate curricular reform.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

ISSUE: Need to integrate comprehensive education criteria/philosophy into specific vocational disciplines.

GOAL: Provide stimulus for vocational faculty upgrading. Identify a core of vocational educators who will be a catalyst for vocational faculty to participate in curricular reform.

BACKGROUND: A belief held by some vocational faculty is that all of the students' time on campus should be devoted to learning the skills required for completion of the vocational program. Time to integrate subject matter, such as economics or sociology into vocational courses, is limited. Confusion about authority and intention result when reference is made to enhancing courses by adding subject matter from academic disciplines. Expectations and goals to be achieved in curricular reform and Title 5 course revisions must be made clear in a supportive and informative manner.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory should assist the colleges in establishing campus vocational education committees to promote vocational discipline reforms.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should facilitate campus workshops developed by these vocational education committees to discuss issues and action plans to accomplish vocational education reform.

(3) The Division of Educational Research and Development should provide assistance in special training for enthusiastic vocational educators who will assist vocational faculty in enhancing their courses on each campus.

(4) The Curriculum Laboratory should plan and conduct a conference for faculty (with emphasis on vocational education) that would pair faculty in related disciplines to "brainstorm" methods of improving curriculum and reducing the number of duplicated courses throughout the District, feature a major authority as the key speaker who can set the tone for cooperative effort among the participants, and provide incentives to faculty for participating.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION

ISSUES:

(1) Lack of core curriculum presenting the humanities from a global perspective and providing an international orientation to specific majors.

(2) Multiplicity of options for fulfilling the humanities general education requirement makes it possible for a student to avoid any exposure to foreign languages or cultures.

GOAL #1: Provide all students with an understanding of the interdependence of different nations and cultures, with special emphasis on what concerns their area of specialization.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Institute for International Programs should continue its existing effort to infuse lessons with international content into existing classes.

(2) The Division of Educational Research and Development should sponsor the development of a team-taught interdisciplinary class presenting the history, cultural development and present status of the peoples of the major geographic subdivisions of the world. This would be a two-semester class, covering social sciences, history and the humanities and centered on a specific central theme of fulfilling the general education requirement for these subjects.

GOAL #2: Establish majors with international emphasis.

RECOMMENDATION: Working with interested departments and discipline representatives, the Curriculum Laboratory should help develop an area-specific comparative core curriculum for selected occupational or transfer majors, covering the language and an introduction into the history, traditions, legal, economic and social structure of the country the student wishes to study. At the end of the study period, the student should be able to transfer to a four-year institution to pursue a degree with a major in the selected field and in the language and culture studied.

GOAL #3: Provide international experience to faculty and students alike.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Curriculum Laboratory should:

(1) Cooperate with the Institute for International Programs in continuing and expanding existing programs for student and faculty exchanges. Establish rapport with internationally oriented organizations, and with colleges or universities in target countries to help sponsor and organize extensive exchange programs.

(2) Cooperate with the Institute for International Programs to provide vocational students with enhanced employment preparation and international background by establishing internship programs in companies operating in countries on which they wish to become specialists. A coordinator should be appointed to arrange this type of internship and to make necessary contacts and agreements with interested departments, government and industry representatives.

GOAL #4: Increase international awareness within the Los Angeles Community College District.

RECOMMENDATION:

The District should establish an International Arts and Humanities Institute to facilitate and coordinate all international activities, assign a budget and appoint a director for such an institute, after identifying a campus at which to locate it. Maintain contacts with the ongoing Humanities programs of the UC-CSU-Unified District in order to benefit from available grant funds and to develop intersegmental faculty cooperation. Establish contacts with cultural organizations representing a multiplicity of ethnic and national identities in order to involve them in international artistic or humanistic events, activities or classes.

PROBLEM: American students are not as well-informed or sensitive to other cultures as required by today's world. Some colleges have very few course offerings in other cultures as a major and/or as general education experience.

GOAL #5: Increase international awareness and understanding of student population.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Curriculum Laboratory should work with an Academic Senate Subcomittee on International Education to:

(1) Select a Faculty Director of International Curriculum Development.

(2) Develop at least five (5) general education area of studies core programs: European-Western Civilization, African, Asian-Pacific, Latin American and American.

(3) Coordinate academic partnership with UCLA/CSU International Programs.

(4) Use foreign and international students as mentors/tutors to assist faculty experts in area of studies.

(5) Use American students specifically as resource persons for American studies, one of the five areas of studies.

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

ISSUES:

(1) Should a language skills floor be set for entry to college?

(2) Should English as a Second Language (ESL) prerequisites be enforced for selected college level courses?

(3) Should there be a "breaking point" between ESL only and enrollment in some content courses?

(4) Should ESL students be placed on a separate track in the "mainstreamed" curriculum?

(5) Should ESL become a separate discipline and staffed with specialists?

(6) Should curriculum committees address ESL placement and standards issues?

(7) Should ESL budget go beyond block funding?

(8) Should ESL concerns be within ESL and vocational education ESL be treated separately?

PROBLEMS:

(1) Proliferation and duplication of courses

(2) Lack of clearly communicated ESL course sequence

(3) Need for proficiency linked to college-level skills standards

(4) Scheduling difficulties and demands on working students

(5) Limited number of trained ESL teaching specialists

GOALS:

(1) Improve success rate of students enrolled in English as a Second Language (ESL) level courses.

(2) Increase number of ESL students who transfer.

(3) Provide a relevant training in vocational and technical content.

(4) Accelerate language acquisition time frame.

(5) Sensitize content area instructions to second language learners' difficulties.

(6) Effectively use technology and tutor/mentor programs in language acquisition and enrichment.

(7) Utilize the cultural diversity of the international student population as a resource in internationalizing the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Division of Educational Research and Development should:

(1) Establish a joint committee of three or four staff members from the ESL Institute and the Curriculum Laboratory to work on needs of ESL students in the following aspects:

   (a) Developing matriculation model.

   (b) Implementing and coordinating ESL proficiencies, including provisions for continued training and up-grading for instructors of ESL courses.

(c) Relating English skills instruction to content areas.

(d) Developing a transfer core curriculum.

(e) Assessing and/or strengthening culture and developing vocational education course sequence and programs with ESL content.

(f) Exploring with Commission from Advancement of Teaching alternative delivery systems, including peer/tutor/mentor programs and use of technology.

(g) Internationalizing the curriculum.

(2) Facilitate a structured, on-going dialogue between the English Council and ESL faculty groups to develop course sequences and equivalents and to eliminate duplication of efforts that result in unnecessary extra course work for ESL students.

(3) Study neighboring district ESL course sequences to provide alternate models.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCIES

ISSUE: Lack of opportunity for Foreign Language faculty to master and adopt new teaching methodologies.

GOAL: Update foreign language curriculum, teaching methodology and instructional support system to comply with newly established demands for teaching proficiency.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Curriculum Laboratory shall assist the foreign language discipline committee to hold a workshop on Introducing Concepts of Teaching for Proficiency to foreign language instructors in the LACCD.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory should work with the Office of Staff Development to secure funds to develop within our faculty specialists in proficiency teaching methodology in order to conduct on-going training workshops and seminars.

(3) The Curriculum Laboratory should create a central clearinghouse for all supporting material that facilitate this form of teaching (CAI, video tapes, films, bibliography, et cetera) and establish a recognition system for faculty who excel in the teaching foreign languages for proficiencies.

(4) The District should facilitate the introduction of "minor" (not commonly taught) languages by establishing a fund to experiment yearly or bi-annually with one or more such languages.

(5) The Division of Educational Research and Development should call for the development of a translator/interpreter program at a central campus.

ORIENTATION AND ADVISEMENT

ISSUE: Students are discouraged because of improperly guided entry to school due to burdensome, lengthy and often confusing admission and enrollment procedures.

GOAL: Simplify admission, enrollment and advisement procedures.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Curriculum Laboratory should provide support to the efforts of the District Matriculation Committee and the colleges to:

(1) Introduce a two-week Preparation to College Workshop for entering students in which students would be tested, counseled, given orientation and registered in a simplified procedure.

(2) Establish a student monitoring and mentoring program to provide follow-up during the period of study at the community college, and to provide direct contact with individuals involved in the occupations students are preparing to enter.

(3) Disseminate information regarding the matriculation model, Pilot Project Entry Center, which is responsive to the needs of the District. The pilot proposal linked students to counselors and peer advisors who would be available for a variety of problems. The proposed Personal Development classes would form the base for goal setting and career exploration.

(4) Distribute the Student Guide brochure developed by the Curriculum Laboratory for use in student orientation.

MODEL PROGRAMS

ISSUES: Flow of students through the curriculum, course offerings, length of time students spend preparing to transfer or complete a program, negative curriculum perception by outside groups and competition with other college districts.

PROBLEMS: What courses should students take to major in a certain discipline? It is difficult for students to plan their schedules with any degree of certainty. There is a confusing array of classes fulfilling the same requirements and an unclear sequencing of courses for specific objectives.

GOALS:

(1) Wherever feasible, develop well-defined course sequences leading to specific goals. Make a commitment to both faculty and students that such sequences will be adhered to and supported.

(2) Demonstrate that scheduling key courses without time conflicts is in the best interest of several departments.

(3) Demonstrate to outside critics that programs offered by District colleges are well-defined and lead to specific goals.

BACKGROUND:

All one has to do is look around the classrooms and hallways of our campuses to realize that there are familiar student faces that appear to have been there forever. This is especially evident in the mathematics, engineering and science disciplines, where there is a relatively high unit requirement. It is

imperative that students in these disciplines be told up-front and without hesitation what background and abilities are expected of them and how to go about meeting those expectations, instead of allowing them to "wander around the curriculum" chasing after an unknown goal.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Curriculum Laboratory should:

(1) Develop as a model for campus use a transfer and degree program for physical sciences and engineering.

(2) Disseminate the model to physical sciences and engineering departments in the District.

(3) Assist departments in facilitating implementation of the model whenever needed.

COMPETENCIES REQUIRED FOR SUCCESS

ISSUES:

(1) A confusing collection of courses/programs inhibits student flow through the curriculum.

(2) Competencies required for success are not made clear.

(3) Students do not complete programs in 2 or 3 years

GOAL: Identify and develop sequential courses of study leading to the completion of specific degree or certificate objectives within two years.

BACKGROUND: Inasmuch as some level of mathematical competency is required of all students enrolling in community colleges and that the scope of such competencies is broad as represented by the existence of a variety of entry-level mathematics courses for our students, it would be helpful to have a better understanding of mathematics course sequence and content options to aid in student advisement and placement.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Curriculum Laboratory, working with the various mathematics departments and the Districtwide Mathematics Council, should:

(1) Develop a Mathematics course flow document model for student consumption.

(2) Assist the separate Mathematics Departments to develop a campus-specific version to be widely used in both regular and supplementary campus publications.

DELIVERY MODES OF INSTRUCTION

ISSUE: Developing instructional technology has created a need to inform the faculty about the use of various instructional delivery systems.

GOAL: Provide information to faculty and administration regarding curricular development and reform by working with faculty and curriculum committees.

BACKGROUND: Both the Commission for the Advancement of Teaching and the Curriculum Laboratory have identified the need to review the impact of educational technology and a variety of instructional delivery systems upon instruction, both in form and content, and upon student outcomes. To the extent that neither the act of teaching nor the curricular content stands alone, it would be beneficial to establish a working relationship between these two bodies.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

(1) The Educational Research and Development Division should set a joint meeting of the Commission for the Advancement of Teaching and the Curriculum Laboratory for early Fall '87 to discuss shared concerns regarding the instructional technology and delivery systems and to establish a permanent working liaison mechanism between these two groups.

(2) The Curriculum Laboratory and the Commission for the Advancement of Teaching should, working jointly and with the support of the District, plan and conduct a major conference on "The Classroom: Year 2000" to address long-range instructional issues.

(3) The Educational Research and Development Division should develop, with the colleges, a plan to upgrade and support the various campus libraries and media centers to complement improvements in instructional content and teaching meethodologies.

OBSOLETE COURSE CONTENT AND TEACHING METHODOLOGIES

GOAL: To establish an on-going mechanism by which faculty and related instructional staff can be kept abreast of important changes and/or improvements in teaching methodologies and respective subject disciplines.

BACKGROUND: Significant changes and improvements have occurred in the past years in instructional delivery approaches and in most subject disciplines. A mechanism must be established to ensure that faculty are the best-equipped and the best-informed individuals within their respective disciplines.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Curriculum Laboratory and the Educational Policy Advisory Committee of the District Academic Senate should convene each Districtwide Discipline Committee to:

(1) Organize and collect information related to the subject matter needs.

(2) Develop priorities with the assistance of the discipline chair as to subject area needs and instructional-delivery-approach needs.

(3) Identify District's sources to meet these needs.

(4) Identify budget resources and, if none exists, propose new line items.

(5) Facilitate the establishment of at least one yearly districtwide workshop to present, review or reinforce new and functional instructional methodologies.

(6) Establish at least one subject area workshop for each discipline. This can be coordinated with professional societies and/or industrial firms holding comparable sessions. (The District should provide funds for attendance.)

(7) Identify to the Curriculum Laboratory the need for the preparation of funding grants for equipment in the event new teaching methodologies are adopted and require new equipment and related materials for implementation.

NETWORKS/GRANTS

ISSUE: Overcome faculty isolation by promoting faculty networks.

GOAL: Work with faculty and Curriculum Committees to establish faculty networks.

BACKGROUND: Several needs of the science, mathematics and engineering departments in the District were clearly indicated at a joint meeting of the chairs of those departments held in the Spring '87 semester. In an effort to resolve some of these problems and to restore quality levels of instruction, the Curriculum Laboratory can provide coordination and support to activities of this group including fund-seeking, grant proposal development, program development, staff development, et cetera.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Curriculum Laboratory should:

(1) Form an Ad Hoc Planning Committee with members from the science, mathematics and engineering departments chairs (SMEDC) and from the Curriculum Laboratory to meet and plan for 1987-88 activities.

(2) Provide assistance to the SMEDC as required to conduct its activities and generate at least one funding proposal per semester.

OBSOLETE EQUIPMENT

ISSUE: The effect of obsolete equipment and inadequate support services on the instructional program.

GOAL: To bring all appropriate disciplines to an instructional level of excellence that can be maintained indefinitely.

BACKGROUND: The needs of Science and Engineering Departments within the Los Angeles Community College District were clearly indicated at a joint meeting held in the Spring semester, 1987.

RECOMMENDATIONS: The Curriculum Laboratory should:

(1) Convene appropriate faculty groups to identify specific problems relating to quality instruction as affected by obsolete equipment and poor or non-existing support services.

(2) Assess equipment, supply needs and maintenance requirements relative to general course offerings.

(3) Evaluate the need to correlate expected educational delivery and costs of operation relating to equipment, supplies, maintenance and repairs.

(4) Establish a permanent file at the Curriculum Laboratory of all information and reports gathered and/or prepared.

(5) Organize and assist in the development and writing of equipment and other related grants. A goal of at least one grant proposal per semester should be the order of the day once most, if not all, pertinent information is on hand.

FACULTY FORUM FOR ACHIEVEMENT

GOAL: Institute a Faculty Forum for Achievement and develop a series of discussions between vocational and academic faculty with emphasis on strenthening the positive aspects of teaching and learning.

BACKGROUND:

Some faculty are so intimidated by faculty who are creating new and interesting teaching techniques that these innovators become less willing to share their successes. The innovative and new thinkers among the faculty are seen as a threat to mediocracy or the status quo. The present peer evaluation process necessitates congeniality within a department which may create difficult relations for people who wish to implement said changes. Strong incentive is needed to highlight new and exciting teaching within the District. Reward for excellence is vital to quality in the curriculum.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Commission on the Advancement of Teaching should:

(1) Make connection with the California Task Force to Promote the Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility relative to teaching issues within the District.

(2) Plan, in cooperation with the Curriculum Laboratory and the Office of Staff Development, a major seminar/conference on the topic featuring Assemblyman Vasconcellos and others on the Task Force.

GENDER EQUITY

ISSUE: Faculty lack awareness of the gender/race biases they personally hold.

GOAL: Promote equality of opportunity, regardless of gender/race, among faculty and have workshop sessions on campus to stimulate discussion and understanding of the biases faculty hold and display toward each other and toward the students.

BACKGROUND: The subtle mannerisms of prejudice often escape us. Habits of verbal speech and body language go unnoticed until brought to attention. The State of California is conducting consciousness-raising sessions which are generally inconvenient for faculty participation. Personal involvement activities such as role-playing and visual replay of actions and words help people to see their biases displayed. The tradition that prevents new teachers from considering employment in disciplines that are dominated by those of another gender or race carries over to students who would consider teaching as a career.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Division of Human Resources should enhance gender equity by:

(1) Developing a format for workshops to promote reason and non-prejudice among faculty. This plan needs to be innovative and provide incentive for faculty to change.

(2) Working with vocational education's categorical funding resources to offer incentive to teachers to attend such a workshop and use it to enhance esteem among faculty.

(3) Seeking funding from the State for the academic faculty to receive an "incentive" as participants. (A possible source might be John Vasconcellos' California Task Force to Promote Self-Esteem and Personal and Social Responsibility.)

AWARENESS OF HEALTH CARE

ISSUE: Faculty and staff awareness to health care issues

GOAL: Develop an on-going and functional system with which to inform the faculty and staff of the major health care issues and/or problems of Los Angeles Community College District.

BACKGROUND: A well-informed staff is a highly functioning staff. Provide service to the personnel of the Los Angeles Community College District.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

The Division of Educational Research and Development and the Division of Human Resources should work together to:

(1) Convene a group of faculty and staff to assess the specific areas relating to health care issues and/or problems that should be brought to the attention of the LACCD staff.

(2) Organize and establish a yearly symposium dealing with such issues.

(3) Prepare and submit one or more items to the various in-house newsletters.

(4) Plan and conduct in 1987-88 a districtwide symposium on sexually-transmitted diseases.

JH:lgv

SELECTED REFERENCES

1. Ahrendt, Kenneth M., ed. Teaching the Developmental Education Student, New Directions for Community Colleges Series, Vol. XV, No. 1. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1987.

2. Berquist, W.H., A Gould and E.M. Greenberg. Designing Undergraduate Education. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1981.

3. Boyer, Ernest. College: The Undergraduate Curriculum, Harper, New York, 1987.

4. Braver, Florence B., ed. Teaching the Sciences, New Directions for Community Colleges Series, Vol. VIII, No. 3. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1980.

5. Cohen, Arthur M., ed. Shaping the Curriculum, New Directions for Community Colleges, Vol. VII, No. 1. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1979.

6. Critical Thinking Resource Collection. Curriculum Laboratory, Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, 1987.

7. English - Language Arts Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten to 12th Grade. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1987.

8. Foreign Language Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten to 12th Grade. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1980.

9. Hayden, Tom. Beyond the Master Plan: A New Vision for Higher Education in California. California State Legislature, Sacramento, 1986.

10. Health Instruction Framework for California Public Schools, 1978 ed. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1985.

11. Kintzer, Frederick C. ed. Improving Articulation and Transfer Relationships, New Directions for Community Colleges Series, Vol. X, No. 3. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1982.

12. Losak, John, ed. Applying Institutional Research in Decision Making, New Directions in Community Colleges Series. Vol. XIV, No. 4. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1986.

13. Mathematics Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten to 12th Grade. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1985.

14. Report of the Commission for the Advancement of Teaching, Part One: General Issues Related to Teaching Excellence. Los Angeles Community College District, Los Angeles, 1985.

15. Science Framework for California Public Schools, Kindergarten to 12th Grade, 1978 Ed. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1985.

16. Simerly, Robert G. Strategic Planning and Leadership in Continuing Education. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1987.

17. Statement on Competencies in Languages Other than English Expected of Entering Freshmenan; Phase I - French, German, Spanish. The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, 1986.

18. Statement on Preparation in Natural Science Expected of Entering Freshmen. The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, 1986.

19. Statements on Preparation in English and Mathematics, Competencies Expected of Entering Freshmen. The Academic Senates of the California Community Colleges, the California State University, and the University of California, 1981.

20. The Agenda: Core Curriculum Development Laboratory. Los Angeles Community College District. Los Angeles, 1987.

21. The Challenge of Change: A Reassessment of the California Community Colleges. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, 1986.

22. The Master Plan Renewed: Unity, Equity, Quality, and Efficiency in California Postsecondary Education. Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education, Sacramento, 1987.

23. Vasconcellos, John. Assembly Bill 1725: California State Legislature, Sacramento, 1987.

24. Visual and Performing Arts Framework for California Public Schools Schools, Kindergarten to 12th Grade. California State Department of Education, Sacramento, 1982.

25. Voegel, George H. ed., Advances in Instructional Technology, New Directions for Community Colleges Series, Vol. XIV, No. 3. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1986.

26. Young, Robert E., ed. Fostering Critical Thinking, New Directions in Teaching and Learning Series, No. 3. Jossey-Bass, Inc. San Francisco, 1980.

27. Zwesling, L. Steven, ed. The Community College and its Critics, New Directions for Community Colleges Series, Vol. XIV, No. 2. Jossey-Bass, Inc., San Francisco, 1986.

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges JUL 29 1988